UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/828,997	04/20/2004	David W. Caldwell	49256-109423	6796
	7590 02/01/201 HORNBURG LLP	EXAMINER		
P.O. Box 2786	60600 2786	ARBES, CARL J		
CHICAGO, IL 60690-2786			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3729	
			NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			02/01/2011	ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

Patent-ch@btlaw.com

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/828,997	CALDWELL ET AL.
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit
	C. J. Arbes	3729
The MAILING DATE of this communication ap Period for Reply	pears on the cover sheet with th	e correspondence address
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPL WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING Description of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1. after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statut Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATI 136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS fr e, cause the application to become ABANDC	ON. The timely filed of this communication. NED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
Status		
1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>06 L</u> 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL . 2b) ☐ This 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowed closed in accordance with the practice under	s action is non-final. ance except for formal matters,	
Disposition of Claims		
 4) Claim(s) 1-25 is/are pending in the application 4a) Of the above claim(s) 20-25 is/are withdra 5) Claim(s) 19 is/are allowed. 6) Claim(s) 1-16 and 18 is/are rejected. 7) Claim(s) 17 is/are objected to. 8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/o 	wn from consideration.	
Application Papers		
9) The specification is objected to by the Examina 10) The drawing(s) filed on 18 May 2010 is/are: a Applicant may not request that any objection to the Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the E	.) accepted or b) objected to a drawing(s) be held in abeyance. Solution is required if the drawing(s) is	See 37 CFR 1.85(a). objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119		
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority document 2. Certified copies of the priority document 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority document application from the International Bureat * See the attached detailed Office action for a list	nts have been received. Its have been received in Applic Pority documents have been rece Bau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	ation No sived in this National Stage
Attachment(s) 1) Motice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) 🔲 Interview Summ	
2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date		

Inasmuch as Applicants formerly elected method claims only method claims 1-19 will now be examined on their merits. That is claims 20-25 are deemed to have been non-elected. Therefore Applicants are required to cancel these claims or take other appropriate action.

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claim 18 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

There is no proper antecedent for ...said layer of third conductive material... and hence this claim is held to be unclear, vague and indefinite.

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 1-6, 15, 16 and 20-22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by over Stoddard EP Pat No. (0 265 110); hereinafter Stoddard. (N.B. a foreign language non-English language, i.e. Japanese equivalent document is of record) This prior art speaks for itself. However in order to further understand how the Office is construing this prior art the reade5r is invited to review the brief comments provided hereinbelow.

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 7-14, 18 and 23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Stoddard.

Stoddard teaches a method of using a transparent electrode. A panel for a liquid crystal display (LCD) is formed by depositing a transparent conductive material such a Indium-Tin Oxide (ITO) (2) onto a transparent backing (1). Nickel can be used and will serve as a bus to power the transparent material (2). The Nickel is first etched to a bus configuration and then the ITO is etched to produce one or more picture elements.(Cf 1st page of the Document) Stoddard also teaches optionally etching the transparent conductive material to form one or more elements connected to one or more busses. (Cf. Col. 2) Stoddard also teaches 2 panels, one on either side of liquid crystal material 6. (Cf. Col. 6) As applied to claims 5, 6, 11 and 12 Stoddard teaches connecting an electrical component e.g. an external power source by soldering (Cf. Col. 6). Although Stoddard does not explicitly teach applying a 3rd conductive material onto the layer of a 2nd conductive material, Stoddard does teach providing Ni, Cu, Au, Ag, or Al for the conductive material and also notes that the material should have a resisitvity of less than 20 micro-ohm cm and have a thickness of between 75-150 nm and by inference it is held a PHOSITA would have been able to provide a 3rd conductive material and place this 3rd conductive material onto the 2nd conductive material so long as the

Art Unit: 3729

resistivity and thickness parameters have been met. As applied to claim 9 it is held that since Niobium behaves substantially as Indium with respect to its physical and chemical properties, it would have been obvious to substitute Niobium for Indium for use as the 2nd conductive material. As applied to claim 10 inasmuch as Stoddard teaches that Cu can be used for the conductive material a PHOSITA would be able to conclude with only ordinary skill that copper can be used in the method of fabricating the electrical circuit. As applied to claims 11 and 12 Stoddard teaches that transparent electrode 5 and that it can be connected to an external power source by soldering (Cf. Col. 6) Therefore it would have been obvious to connect an electrical component to the 2nd conductive material by soldering. As applied to claims 13 and 14 inasmuch as Stoddard teaches sputtering as a means of providing an ITO coating on the substrate (Cf. Col 4) this described technique does involve a a vacuum and a pretreatment of the substrate and hence claims 13 and 14 it ie held to have been obvious.

Claim 17 is objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Claim 19 is held to be allowable.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to C. J. Arbes whose telephone number is 571-272-4563. The examiner can normally be reached on M, T, R and F from 8 to 6.

Application/Control Number: 10/828,997 Page 5

Art Unit: 3729

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, D. Banks, can be reached on (571) 272-4419. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://portal.uspto.gov/external/portal. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

/C. J. Arbes/

Primary Examiner, Art Unit 3729